

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is amended and is the sole independent claim.

DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLE EMBODIMENTS

A non-limiting example embodiment is described to assist the Examiner in understanding the function of the present application and the differences between the present application and the prior art of record. Applicants submit that this description is only to assist the Examiner's understanding and should not limit any of claims 1-6 in any way. Instead, each claim should be interpreted solely based upon the limitations presented therein.

Non-limiting example embodiments are directed to a method for managing complex operations. An example of such a complex operation may be free access to an event if the user subscribes to a certain channel or if the event is broadcast on the user's birthday, for example. In order to perform such an example operation, the message contained in the EPG may contain an operation in a structured language. This operation may be able to handle a combination of at least two parameters such as a channel number and a birthday date, for example. These parameters can be chosen among the access rights received in authorization management messages, initialization data (for example, birthday of the registered user, Zip code,...) or data related to the use of the decoder (for example, paid pay per view events, subscription to several sport channels,...). According to example embodiments, specific viewing rights may not be sent in advance to the

subscribers. These rights may be created based on the history of previously viewed events.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0020297 to Inoue ("Inoue"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

In Inoue, the Electric Program Guide (EPG) contains access conditions that must be fulfilled to have access to the corresponding data. The smart card contains a conventional memory and/or database containing rights received in entitlement management messages. A type of possible right corresponds to a given set of channels for a given time. In the Inoue method, for a specific event to be displayed on the EPG, EPG data is sent to a receiver/decoder. The corresponding access conditions are extracted from the data and sent to the security module of the decoder. The security module checks for the rights of the event in its memory. The manner in which the event is displayed depends on the presence or absence of the rights. As such, in the Inoue method, the sole operation the security unit has to perform is a simple comparison between the required access conditions and the existing rights. Based on the comparison, one of the two possible values "access authorized" or "access denied" are output. This method of operation is similar to the prior art method of operation as disclosed in the pending application. In Inoue, as explained above, the access is authorized or refused on the basis of a comparison between an access condition sent in the EPG and a right memorized in the security module. This indicates that, for the access to be possible, it is necessary to send the corresponding right in advance to the security module of Inoue. While Inoue may arguably teach conditional access to the EPG data

received, Inoue fails to disclose or fairly suggest, "wherein the access condition contained in the condition block is expressed in the form of an operation described by a **request in a structured language**," as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants claim 1 have amended claim 1 to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the prior art of record. For example, Inoue fails to disclose or fairly suggest "**request using a combination of at least two parameters**," as recited in independent claim 1. In the Inoue method, the access can be authorized only if the corresponding right was sent in advance.

For these reasons, *Inoue* fails to anticipate each and every limitation of claim 1. Claims 3-6, dependent on independent claim 1, are patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 as well as for their own merits.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Claim 2, dependent on independent claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 as well as for its own merits. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants hereby petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$130.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/AZP
Ard